

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|
| In re application of |) | |
| |) | |
| Nicholas Mark Turner Adams et al. |) | |
| |) | |
| Serial No.: | 10/509,192 |) Art Unit |
| | |) 1797 |
| Filed: | September 24, 2004 |) |
| | |) |
| Confirmation No.: | 7407 |) |
| | |) |
| For: | METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR |) |
| | DECONTAMINATING ENCLOSED SPACES |) |
| | |) |
| Examiner: | Kevin Joyner |) |

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Examiner:

On March 24, 2009, a telephone interview was conducted in the above identified application between the undersigned (representing the Applicant) and Examiner Kevin C. Joyner. During the interview the currently claimed invention was discussed and contrasted with the primary cited art (WO 00/74734 to Watling). In particular, various arguments were presented and discussed as to why it would not have been obvious to position the Watling apparatus within a sealed enclosure, generally as presented in the response to Office Action filed on March 4, 2009. These arguments included i) heat generated by the Watling apparatus would make it nearly impossible to detect when microcondensation occurs within the sealed enclosure, ii) it would be extremely dangerous for an operator to monitor and control the device within a sealed enclosure, iii) the sterilant would corrode the Watling apparatus within the sealed enclosure; and iv) cross contamination would occur when moving from one sealed enclosure to another as the Watling apparatus is not designed to sterilize itself.

The Examiner stated that he would take the issues discussed in the interview into consideration when reviewing our March 4th response.

Dated this 23rd day of April, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott A. Woodbury/ Reg. #55743
SCOTT A. WOODBURY

Registration 55,743
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800

2192456_1